

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/510,055
Office Action dated: 04/08/08
Response dated: 07/08/08

PATENT
PU020098

Remarks/Arguments

In the non-final Office Action dated April 8, 2008, it is noted that claims 1-27 are pending and that claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 22-27 have been cancelled in this response.

In view of the amendments above and the following remarks, it is submitted that the claims pending in the application are novel and nonobvious. It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the present application are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,847,778 to Vallone et al. (hereinafter "Vallone") in view of U.S. Patent 6,360,053 to Wood et al. (hereinafter "Wood"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 21 are independent claims. Claims 2-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent base claim 1. The dependent claims include all the limitations of independent base claim 1.

Claim 1 calls, in part, for:

A video playback apparatus having means to invoke one of a replay function and a reverse function upon receipt of a first signal, wherein said replay function is activated in response to said first signal exhibiting a first duration of time and wherein said reverse function is activated in response to said first signal exhibiting a second duration of time different from said first duration, and means to invoke one of a skip function and a forward function upon receipt of a second signal different from the first signal, wherein said skip function is activated in response to said second signal exhibiting a third duration of time and wherein said forward function is activated in response to said second signal exhibiting a fourth duration of time different from said third duration.

According to claim 1 and based on the duration of a received first signal, either the replay function or the reverse function is activated; and based on the duration of a received second signal, either the skip function or the forward function is activated. That is, one means can invoke the replay function if the first signal has a first time duration and that same means can also invoke the reverse function if the same first signal has a second time duration different from the first time duration. In addition, another means can invoke the skip function if the second signal has a third time duration and that same (another) means can also invoke the forward function if the

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/510,055
Office Action dated: 04/08/08
Response dated: 07/08/08

PATENT
PU020098

same second signal has a fourth time duration different from the third time duration. As admitted in the present Office Action at page 3, Vallone fails to teach, show, or suggest these means or their functionality.

Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Vallone does not even suggest that the replay function and the reverse function are invoked by a first means upon receipt of the first signal and that the skip function and the forward function are invoked by a second means upon receipt of the second signal, wherein the first and second signals are different. In the cited portion of the specification at col. 10 of Vallone, it is clear that the remote control has a fast forward key and a separate fast reverse key. Vallone does not even remotely mention the existence of the skip function and the replay function. Nowhere does Vallone suggest that multiple functions are invocable from the same button on the remote control.

Woods has apparently been added to Vallone to cure certain infirmities in Vallone. Woods appears to disclose a method and apparatus for making temporal movements through recorded media. In cols. 3 and 4 of his specification, Woods suggests that the rate of fast forwarding can be increased by depressing and holding the fast forward button for a longer period of time. The longer the time that the button is depressed translates into more increases to the fast forwarding speed or rate. Woods discusses the similar operation for the rewind button and for the playback or play button. In an alternative embodiment, Woods suggests that, by depressing and holding yet another button on the remote, it is possible to jump more or less of a temporal distance (e.g., 5 sec. or 30 sec.) on the recorded medium. From the disclosure in col. 4, Woods seems to indicate that one button is dedicated to forward temporal distance movements while another button would be dedicated to reverse temporal distance movements.

Contrary to the assertion in the present Office Action, there is no teaching, showing, or suggestion that two different functions are invocable from the same single button of Woods when it is held for one time duration or another – it is assumed that the present Office Action has drawn a correspondence between the button in Woods and the "means" in claim 1. Woods merely appears to suggest that the rate at which a particular function operates is capable of being varied by the amount of time that the related function button is depressed. Woods also suggests that for a different class of button the temporal distance over which the media player

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/510,055
Office Action dated: 04/08/08
Response dated: 07/08/08

PATENT
PU020098

may move is similarly capable of being varied by the amount of time that the related function button is depressed. In other words, Woods provides only a single function on a remote controller button and then he allows the rate or speed of that function to be varied in response to the button being depressed for a long or short duration. Nowhere does Woods teach, show, or suggest that two different functions can be invoked from the same button in response to the button being depressed for one duration or another.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is believed that claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art upon a reading of Vallone and Woods, either separately or in combination. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-20 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 is a method claim including limitations similar in nature to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above, it is believed that claim 21 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art upon a reading of Vallone and Woods, either separately or in combination. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 21 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6813, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.


CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/510,055
Office Action dated: 04/08/08
Response dated: 07/08/08

PATENT
PU020098

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
SCOTT ALLAN KENDALL

By:


Reitseng Lin, Attorney
Reg. No. 42,804
Phone (609) 734-6813

RSL.pdf

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

July 8, 2008